UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,618	02/11/2002	Jian Cao	MSFT-0767/186581.1	4512

41505 7590 10/17/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER	
BILGRAMI, ASGHAR H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/073,618	CAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ASGHAR BILGRAMI	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 June 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-58* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-58* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 16 & 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are claiming **"a modulated data signal"** carrying computer executable instructions, which is non statutory. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 17, 35 and 39 are single means claims because in these claims, the "means" recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of the means, and is therefore subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph. In re Hyatt, 708 F2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling (U.S. Pub No 2003/0182447 A1) and Schneider et al (U.S. 2005/0235031A1)

7. As per claims 1, 15-18, 36, 38, 39, 40, 55-57 & 58 Schilling disclosed a computing system, a method for providing runtime automatic universal resource locator (URL) analysis and suggestion in connection with a service accessed from a client computing device utilizing a URL input mechanism, comprising: inputting URL input to the URL input mechanism of the client computing device (page.2, paragraphs.10 & 16). However Schilling did not explicitly disclose determining whether the URL input is valid and if invalid, detecting whether said input is likely candidate for multilingual analysis, and if said input is a likely candidate for said multilingual analysis, transmitting said URL input to a server computing device for intelligent rules-based analysis, including said multilingual analysis, and identification of the invalid URL input; transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL and outputting at least one valid alternative URL based upon said analysis, and suggesting at least one of the alternative URLs; wherein said detecting whether said input is a likely candidate for multilingual analysis is based on at least one character inside a domain portion of said URL being above a specified code

point, and wherein said domain portion does not include a normalized space, and wherein said domain portion includes at least on normalized period but the period is not leading or trailing.

In the same filed of endeavor Schneider disclosed determining whether the URL input is valid (Paragraph.22) and if invalid, detecting whether said input is likely candidate for multilingual analysis (Paragraph.56), transmitting said URL input to a server computing device for intelligent rules-based analysis of the invalid URL input; transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL (paragraphs.27 & 28) and outputting at least one valid alternative URL based upon said analysis, and suggesting at least one of the alternative URLs(paragraphs. 12, 26 & 56); wherein said detecting whether said input is a likely candidate for multilingual analysis is based on at least one character inside a domain portion of said URL being above a specified code point, and wherein said domain portion does not include a normalized space, and wherein said domain portion includes at least on normalized period but the period is not leading or trailing (paragraphs 62-64).

It would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated determining URL validation, multilingual analysis and the rules based URL correction as disclosed by Schneider in a computing system utilizing a URL input mechanism disclosed by Schilling in order to provide and promote most likely or accurate URL matches to the user resulting in creating an environment that is user friendly and facilitates the user in their URL search task.

8. As per claims 2, 21 & 43 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one database of known URLs includes a dynamically updated database of current URLs (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 26).

9. As per claims 3, 22 & 44 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one database of known URLs includes a top URL list checked before any other database (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 26).

10. As per claims 4, 23 & 45 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 3, wherein the at least one database of known URLs includes secondary list which is analyzed after the top URL list if at least one alternative URL is not found based on an analysis of the top URL list (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 21).

11. As per claims 5, 24 & 46 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 4, wherein the at least one database of known URLs includes a complete list of URLs which is analyzed after the secondary list if at least one alternative URL is not found based on an analysis of the secondary list (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 21).

12. As per claims 6, 19 & 20 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 1, further including preprocessing the URL input to at least one of (1) remove non-domain name service (DNS) characters (2) to replace non-DNS characters and (3) to correct an error in protocol (Schilling, Page.3, paragraphs. 23, 24 & 27).

13. As per claims 7, 25 & 47 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein the client device includes a browser and the URL input is URL input intended for one of navigation to a Web site and search on a Web site (Schilling, page.2, paragraph.16).

14. As per claims 8, 26 & 48 A method according to claim 1, further including displaying the suggested alternative URLs to the user via an error page (Schilling, page.3, paragraph.24).

15. As per claims 9, 27 & 49 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 8, further including performing a search with the URL input as a query and displaying the results of the search on the error page (Schilling, page.3, paragraphs. 23 & 24).

16. As per claims 10, 28, 37 & 50 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 8, further including displaying a link on the client computing device error page, which link, if input by the user, retries the original URL input (Schilling, page.3, paragraph.24).

17. As per claims 11, 29 & 51 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 8, further including tracking user behavior in response to the display of the error (Schneider, paragraph.22).

18. As per claims 12, 30 & 52 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 55, wherein the at least one database includes URLs that are weighted according to their popularity (Schilling, page.1, paragraph.8).

19. As per claims 13, 31 & 53 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein said rules based analysis includes applying rules from a rules based table (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 21).

20. As per claims 14, 32 & 54 Schilling-Schneider disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein said rules based analysis includes applying rules to the analysis based upon said at least one known URLs database (Schneider, paragraph.65).

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 6/19/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

22. Applicant argued that the prior arts fail to disclose the amended the limitation of the independent claims.

As to applicant's argument Schneider clearly discloses the limitation "at least one character inside a domain portion of said URL being above a specified code point, and wherein said domain portion does not include a normalized space, and wherein said domain portion includes at least on normalized period but the period is not leading or trailing" in paragraphs 62 through 64.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASGHAR BILGRAMI whose telephone number is (571)272-3907. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia L.M. Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2443

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454